REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above referenced application in view of the enclosed amendments and remarks is requested. This amendment cancels claims 1-60 and enters new claims 61-90 to claim the invention more broadly. Claims 61, 71, and 81 are the independent claims.

ARGUMENT

The Office Action rejects the claims 1-60 based on 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). Applicants respectfully assert that those rejections are not well founded. In addition, to the extent that those rejections might be applied to the new claims, Applicants respectfully traverse.

35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The Office Action rejects claims 1-60 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. patent no. 6,226,749 to Marius Carloganu et al. (hereinafter "Carloganu"). To the extent that the rejections in the Office Action might be applied to any of the present claims, Applicants respectfully traverse.

Carloganu pertains to an apparatus for processing "secured commands" and "non-secured commands" received from external devices. Specifically, according to Carloganu, "an application program running in an external device" sends non-secured and secured commands to "a secure processor" for execution. The secure processor "immediately executes" the non-secured commands, and the secured processor only executes secured commands if those commands pass tests for "authenticity" and "regularity." The secure processor determines which commands are secured and which are non-secured by looking up each received command in a "command set up table." (Abstract.)

By contrast, claim 81 in the present application recites a processing system comprising a processor that supports a normal execution mode and an isolated execution mode. In addition, the processor comprises an access checking circuit that prevents access to an isolated memory area of the processing system if the

processor is not "set to operate in the isolated execution mode." In particular, the operations of the access checking circuit comprise "disallowing the transaction if [a] the transaction requests access to an isolated memory area of the processing system and [b] the processor is not set to operate in the isolated execution mode."

As indicated above, Carloganu uses a command set up table to determine whether a command is a secured command, and then only executes secured commands if those commands pass tests for "authenticity" and "regularity." Carloganu says nothing about determining whether a command involves access to memory. Carloganu also says nothing about disallowing transactions, based on the type of memory area to be accessed and the current setting of the processor. For at least these reasons, Carloganu does not anticipate claim 81.

The other pending independent claims (i.e., claims 61 and 71) include features that are the same as or similar to the features discussed above with regard to claim 81, and the dependent claims inherently include the features of their respective parent claims.

In addition, the independent and dependent claims recite numerous additional features that are not disclosed by Carloganu. For example, claim 82 recites that the access checking circuit "allows access to the isolated memory area when the processor is set to operate in the isolated execution mode" and "prevents access to the isolated memory area when the processor is not set to operate in the isolated execution mode." Claim 84 recites that the processor (a) creates an isolated memory area in the memory of the processing system, based at least in part on configuration parameters for the isolated memory area, and (b) determines whether the transaction requests access to the isolated memory area, based at least in part on (i) access information for the transaction and (ii) one or more of the configuration parameters for the isolated memory area. Claim 86 recites that (a) the processor comprises "a processor control register to store an isolated execution mode setting," and (b) the processor determines whether the processor is set to operate in the isolated execution mode, "based at least in part on the isolated execution mode setting from the processor control register."

For reasons including those set forth above, Carloganu does not anticipate any of pending claims of the present application.

Information Disclosure Statements

The Office Action includes a copy of an Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) that was originally submitted for this application on January 26, 2004. That IDS lists four foreign patent documents and five "other documents." However, there are only examiner initials for the five "other documents." Applicants respectfully request confirmation that the four foreign patent documents have also been considered.

The Office Action also includes a copy of an IDS that was originally submitted for this application on June 29, 2004. That IDS lists eight foreign patent documents and fifteen "other documents." However, there are only examiner initials for the fifteen "other documents." Applicants respectfully request confirmation that the eight foreign patent documents have also been considered.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, claims 61-90 are all in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (512) 732-3927. Prompt issuance of Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 11/23/04

Michael R. Barré
Patent Attorney
Intel Americas, Inc.
Registration No. 44,023
(512) 732-3927

c/o Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor &
Zafman, LLP
12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026